IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

MONDAY, THE TWENTY SEVENTH DAY OF DECEMBER
TWO THOUSAND AND FOUR

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE K.C. BHANU

–

WRIT PETITION NO : 24200 of 2004

Between:

Heeroji, Conductor, C/o Balaram, Ramnagar,
Mahaboobnagar District

..... PETITIONER

AND

The Depot Manager, APSRTC., Mahaboobnagar District

.....RESPONDENT

Petition under Article 226 of the constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court will be pleased to issue a Writ, order or directions, more in the nature of writ of Mandamus, declaring the office order No.: 2/95(23)/95-MBNR dt
26-5-1995 as illegal and arbitrary and set aside the same with all consequential benefits including arrears.

Counsel for the Petitioner: MR.P.GOVINDA RAJULU

Counsel for the Respondent: MR.P.VINAYAKA SWAMY (S.C. FOR APSRTC)

The Court at the admission stage, made the following:

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE K.C. BHANU

–

WRIT PETITION NO : 24200 of 2004

–

–

ORDER:

The petitioner is working as a conductor in the respondent-Corporation. He was issued a charge memo on 01-5-1995 and after receiving the explanation of the petitioner, the final orders were passed on 26-05-1995 imposing the penalty of withholding of one incremental stage for a period of one years with cumulative effect. The petitioner questioned the order on the ground that though there is reduction of annual increment with cumulative effect is a major penalty, the respondent passed the impugned order without conducting any enquiry as required under the rules. Therefore, the order is illegal and it is liable to be set aside.

2. The learned Counsel for the petitioner relied on a judgment of the Supreme Court in **Kulwant Singh Gill v. State of Punjab**[1] wherein the Supreme Court held that since the punishment imposed on the petitioner is a major punishment, the order cannot be sustained without an enquiry. The petitioner therefore seeks to declare that the order is illegal and it is liable to be set aside.

3. The petitioner after receiving the adverse orders slept over the matter for a period of 9 years. There are latches on his part in asserting his right regarding this issue. Though the impugned order is liable to be set aside on account of long lapse of time, in view of the judgment of the Supreme Court in **Kulwant Singh** Gill (1 supra), I am of the view that it would be appropriate if the punishment imposed on the petitioner is treated as reduction of one annual increment without cumulative effect. The petitioner is not entitled for the difference of the amount, if any, by virtue of this order for the period from the date of the impugned order till the date of this order. But, he is entitled to get

increments on notional calculation from the date of this order to which he is entitled, as he had not been imposed penalty of reduction of one annual increment without cumulative effect.

4. The Writ Petition is accordingly disposed of with the above observations.

_____

December 27, 2004

Kvr

To

1. The Depot Manager, APSRTC., Mahaboobnagar District.

2. 2 C.D copies.